UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/585,305	09/27/2006	Taro Suzuki	21581-00443-US	2352
	7590 12/16/200 BOVE LODGE & HUT	EXAMINER		
1875 EYE STR		WEBB, WALTER E		
SUITE 1100 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1612	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/16/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/585,305	SUZUKI ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	WALTER E. WEBB	1612	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>06 November 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS			
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperfor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of replies: (1) an amendment, affidaveal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request
a) \boxtimes The period for reply expires $\underline{4}$ months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this An no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	iter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FI	on. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount hortened statutory period for reply orig	of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wind AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	ocalice ocalice
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NO		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet	er form for appeal by materially re	ducing or simplifying t	ne issues for
appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	porroonanding number of finally rei	acted claims	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1		ected claims.	
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	* **	mpliant Amendment (PTOL-324)
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mphanes anonamone (1 02 02 1/1
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ll be entered and an e	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-22</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but Applicant's argument's are moot at this time since the an		n condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. ☐ Other:			
/Frederick Krass/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1612	/Walter E Webb/ Examiner, Art Unit 1612		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant as amended claim 1 to recite the phrase "wherein said hydrophilic polymer component comprises a combination of a first hydrophilic polymer and a second hydrophilic polymer, wherein said first hydrophilic polymer and said second hydrophilic polymer have different structures." Applicant states that support for this limitation can be found in the original claim 6. However, the original claim 6 does not support this limitation. Claim 6 states, "The allergen suppressor according to Claim 1, 2, 3, 4 or 5, wherein at least two species of the hydrophilic polymers having different structures are used in combination." The claim does not mention first or second hydrophilic polymers, but at least two species. The scope is much broader since it is not limited to only two hydrophilic polymers. Claim 6, is also drawn to a different allergen suppressor since the currently amended claims incude a water-insoluble polymer. Claim 6 also recites that the hydrophilic polymers are used in combination, which does not necessarily mean that the hydrophilic polymer comprises two or more different species. The limitation also requires a new search or consideration since it is new, and adds a new hydrophilic polymer that has not been considered.